

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 37, NO. 18

March 27, 1944

WHOLE NO. 994

BRIEF STUDIES IN PLATO

The Joyous Life of Gods (*Hussey*); A Soldierly Socrates (*Hussey*);
A 'Heliocentric' Interpretation of the *Timaeus* (*Solmsen*)

REVIEWS

BROWN, Modern Latin Conversation (*Beach*); CARY, Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*McDermott*); WINSLOW, Conquest of Epidemic Diseases (*Stahl*); ROSENTHAL, Ahmad B. At-Tayyib as-Sarahsi (*Steiner*)

Announcing the long awaited final volume of

PAIDEIA The Ideals of Greek Culture

By WERNER JAEGER

Translated by GILBERT HIGHET

With the publication of Vol. III of this monumental work, Professor Jaeger, Director of Harvard's Institute of Classical Studies, completes the most original and comprehensive exposition of Greek literature, philosophy and life which has appeared in the 20th century. Volume I begins with Homer and ends with the defeat of Athens at the end of the fifth century. Volumes II and III, describing the efforts of the greatest Greek thinkers to shore up their collapsing civilization through the fourth century B. C.,

center on the four Athenians who embodied the active culture of the period: Socrates the questioner, Plato the philosopher, Isocrates the teacher, and Demosthenes the statesman.

"This is the most illuminating book I have ever read on Greece . . . No one who reads Professor Jaeger's book will ever again be condescending to the truths that began to live in Greece three thousand years ago."—Edith Hamilton, N. Y. Times Book Review.

Each Volume \$3.75

The set, three volumes, \$10.00

Oxford UNIVERSITY PRESS - 114 FIFTH AVE., NEW YORK 11



N. Y.

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Franklin B. Krauss, Secretary and Treasurer, Pennsylvania State College; Box 339, State College, Penna.

Contributing Editors: Lionel Casson, Jotham Johnson, Eugene W. Miller, Charles T. Murphy, J. C. Plumpe, Bluma L. Trell. Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, or the District of Columbia, a subscription to CLASSICAL WEEKLY (or, alternatively, to The Classical Journal) is included in the membership fee of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, whose members are also entitled to The Classical Outlook and The Classical Journal at special prices in combinations available from the Secretary-Treasurer.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 37 contains issues dated: October 4, 11, 18, 25; November 1, 15, 29; December 6, 13 (1943); January 3, 10, 17; February 7, 14; March 6, 13, 20, 27; April 17, 24; May 1, 8, 15, 22; June 5 (1944).

Whether for good or for mere time-killing, subject clubs continue to multiply in our schools. Now and then a teacher of Latin, forgetting who invented and perfected the school club as a supplement to classroom exercises, raises a voice of protest against these prolific organizations. The school club of today is a direct lineal descendant of the academic literary society which was the tonic of school life a century ago and which fairly flaunted its place and purpose in its polysyllabic classical name, its Homeric motto, and its nomenclature bodily borrowed from the magistracies of antiquity. Frayed and yellowed programs are to be seen in libraries and are reproduced in memoirs. The schoolboy who debated the comparative greatness of Demosthenes and Cicero or Terence and Plautus now has a great-grandson and even a great-granddaughter on the rosters of a Pan-American Club and a dozen others devoted to anything from religion to philately. And not one among all the current club activities can seem less remote from educational pertinence than the early Philomathic or Dikasterion seemed to some schoolmaster of a century ago.

Some teachers hold in particularly low esteem the Pan-American clubs, which a recent Office of Education publication finds in 1090 schools, distributed among the states from the 123 in New York and the 100 in Texas to the rare states which report only one such organization. How familiar sounds the paragraph which tells the accomplishments of these clubs:

In addition to regular meetings, the club members usually contribute to civic programs, make radio broadcasts publicizing the school, and arrange assembly programs for the student body. Their projects include stamp collecting, corresponding with young people in other countries, exchanging scrapbooks, pictures and souvenirs, adding material to the school library, and making contact with visiting Latin-American teachers who are in this country. (Education for Victory 2.15.25)

The more alert Latinist recognizes the flattery of imitation and industriously cooperates with the young Pan-American enthusiasts, who—pupils and teachers alike sometimes—gasp with amazement that the Latin teacher knows not only both the languages of Latin

America, in contrast to their own meagre one, but the culture, the spirit, above all the religion that have produced the features of life in the South which are hardest for young nordicos to comprehend. Some schools report the opening of elementary Latin classes for those students who have found in the study of Spanish a motive for an acquaintance with its classical ancestor.

The Latin teacher must especially avoid looking on the Spanish teacher as a species of poor relation. The two have far too much in common not to welcome the opportunity to work together for the attainment of those by-products of language study that mean so much in American education today. Each learns much from the study of the language of the other.

In particular, one may hope not often to find the two languages in the queer relationship reported from a school recently. A young man was explaining why he had studied Spanish but not Latin. At his 'village high school, he said, boys elected either to study foreign language or not; those who chose a language course were sorted by the school principal on the basis of I.Q. records, those above a certain rating put into Latin classes, those below that figure into Spanish with the assurance that it was easier and hence more probably within the range of their narrower talents. There is a town which will surely not be standing in the front row when the Good Neighbor medals are given out.

At the thirty-ninth Annual Meeting of the Classica Association of New England, held at Deerfield Academy in Massachusetts March 17-18, the following were elected officers for the new year: Dr. George A. Land, Newton High School, President; Professor Josephine P. Bree, Albertus Magnus College, Vice-President; Professor John W. Spaeth, Jr., Wesleyan University, Secretary and Treasurer.

Others elected to the Association's executive committee are Miss Doris S. Barnes, High School, Nashua, New Hampshire, and Mr. John K. Colby, Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts. Mr. Colby's institution will entertain the 1945 meeting of the Association next March.

Mr. C. W. Dressler, to prove his point that truancy from meetings is not an invention of the Senate of the United States, but has its roots deep in ancient political practice, quotes a dozen lines from Cicero's First Philippic in an article that appeared in The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette February 18, 1944, under the title "The Late Mr. Cicero on Senate Absenteeism." He cites the occasion of Cicero's absence from the senate house September 1, 44 and notes that Cicero justified his absenteeism on the ground that his trip to Rome had exhausted him. Cicero cuttingly remarked: "Hannibal

was at the gates, I suppose, or perhaps Pyrrhus' peace was the subject for debate."

Calling this newspaper article to the attention of CLASSICAL WEEKLY gives to Mr. Howard C. Smith of Leisenring, Pennsylvania, a new opportunity to commend for timely reading Mr. H. J. Haskell's lessons in the longevity of political attitudes. (With the spread of the quaint word 'absenteeism' why does Mr. Smith not call them 'politicianisms'?) Mr. Haskell's book, This Was Cicero, has won the approval of favorable reviews in Great Britain, we are happy to be informed.

BRIEF STUDIES IN PLATO

The Joyous Life of Gods

In Alcibiades II, 147b1 the question under discussion is whether general knowledge can replace special professional training. Thus for a captain—*διατελών ἐν πηλάγει χρόνον οὐ μακρὸν βίον θεῶν*—continuing for a brief time a life of gods. To use an English proverb, he would live carefree in a fool's paradise.

The text quoted above conforms strictly to the manuscripts. It seems an echo from Phaedrus 248a, where the life of the blessed gods is described as they follow Zeus in a procession in their winged chariots. The only function that could match it in the classical world, and that but faintly, was the Roman triumph.

The editors have toned down the passage considerably. Stephanus changed *θεῶν* into *θέων* 'running' and *βίον* into *βίον*. Thus according to him the meaning should be 'running no long time of life.' Stallbaum, Hermann and Burnet followed Stephanus. Schanz made a further change from *θέων* to *πλέων*; although any expression such as running a time of life or sailing it is improbable and certainly does not occur in Plato. The scribe of manuscript B unfortunately did not accent *θεῶν*; and so put himself outside of the textual question, probably quite without intending it.

A Soldierly Socrates

At the end of the Symposium (223d10) Alcibiades had, as it were, decorated Socrates for bravery at Delium and Potidaea when, at the conclusion of his speech, owing to the lateness of the hour the guests either left or fell asleep one by one in their places.

Then as the morning came, Socrates arose and left, *καὶ ὥσπερ εἰσθεὶ ἐπεισθαί*, even as he was accustomed to follow orders, that is, soldier-like, with ceremony. For a similar meaning of *ἐπεισθαί* compare Laws 641a7 where we read that, if a military organization enjoys right leadership, *νίκη τοῖς ἐπομένοις* 'victory is to those that follow.'

Such a use of *ἐπεισθαί* obviates the need of a new subject (such as *αὐτός* or *ἐ*) referring to Aristodemus, the narrator of the whole dialogue. By most editors some such word is inserted but by conjecture only. They would—with jarring effect—make him say something about himself between participles that describe Socrates. That Aristodemus had followed Socrates in a

literal sense is indeed true. This however was told at 174b3 in quite another part of the dialogue. In the sense of 'understand' the verb is found at 223d7, showing that various meanings of the same word in the same dialogue are not at all avoided.

GEORGE B. HUSSEY

WEST DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA

A 'Heliocentric' Interpretation of the Timaeus

Plato's cosmic system is definitely geocentric. Each of us may decide for himself whether he will credit Plutarch's story (told on the authority of Theophrastus) that when Plato had grown old he repented of having assigned to earth the central position;¹ in his works no sign of this repentance can be found. The Pythagorean doctrine of a 'central fire'² is not even mentioned in them. In the Phaedo (108e) the earth is explicitly put in the centre, and this is evidently also the doctrine of the Timaeus, though in this dialogue Plato merely says that the earth "winds round the axis that stretches right through"; so then, if this happens below or above the actual centre what other body would be in the centre?³ Aristotle understood Timaeus 40b as meaning that the earth was situated at the centre, and so did other Greek philosophers.⁴

The Timaeus also includes Plato's fullest account of the heavenly bodies, their nature, and their movements. The fixed stars rotate on the outermost sphere of the Heaven, which Plato calls the 'Circle of the Same'; the planets move, each in its own sphere, fundamentally in the opposite direction—in Plato's language, in the 'Circle of the Different.' Both circles are parts of the World-Soul, and the everlasting celestial rotations are brought about by this great cosmic organ which the divine architect of the world has created in order to impart to the Universe eternal life, movement, and

¹Plutarch, Numa 11; Quaest. Plat. 1006c.

²Cf. the most recent discussions of this 'fire' in F. M. Cornford, Plato's Cosmology (London 1937) 124; J. B. Skemp, The Theory of Motion in Plato's Later Dialogues (Cambridge 1942) 71ff.

³Cf. (also on the 'winding' motion) Cornford, 120-9; T. L. Heath, Aristarchus of Samos (Oxford 1913) 174ff.

⁴Aristotle, De coelo 293b30; for others see Cornford, 120 n. 1; 121 n. 2.

intrinsic harmony.⁵ The 'psychic' factor is the first entity in Plato's Cosmos; it is 'older' than the physical elements. Ancient commentators rightly felt that an adequate understanding of Plato's conception of the Cosmos hinges on the correct interpretation of the nature and functions of the cosmic soul.

The Soul spreads out through the entire Cosmos. Since it is directly responsible for the movements of the stars and planets, we can understand why Plato asserts that the soul "envelops the Cosmos all round on the outside."⁶ Yet its centre coincides with the physical centre of the Universe. At this point the body and soul of the Cosmos are joined together. Plato's language allows us no doubt: the Demiurge "brought the two together, fitting them centre to centre" (*μέσον μέση συναγαγὼν προσήρμοτε*).⁷ If these words mean anything, the World-Soul must have its centre in the earth. The inference follows logically from the geocentric orientation of Plato's cosmic scheme.

It is interesting to note that some ancient commentators of the Timaeus take a different view and that in supporting it they try to do justice at once to the geocentric tradition and to a new, post-Platonic feeling for the wellsprings of cosmic life. Chalcidius, in commenting on our passage, reports their views as follows (ch. 99):

Illud vero quod a meditullio porrecta anima esse dicitur quidam dici sic putant: ut non tamquam a medietate totius corporis facta dimensione porrecta sit, sed ex ea parte membrorum vitalium in quibus pontificium vivendi situm sit. . . Non ergo a medietate corporis quae terra est sed a regione vitalium, id est a sole, animae vigorem infusum esse mundano corpori potius intelligendum pronuntiant. Siquidem terra immobilis, Sol vero semper in motu. Itemque uteri medietas immobilis, cor⁸ semper in motu. . . ideoque solem cordis obtinere rationem.

The reasoning is clear. It was not, we are taught, Plato's intention to determine by accurate measurement the physical *medietas* of the cosmic body; for to make this point the fountain of movement and life would be as futile as to determine in the same way the point from which the human body receives its vital energy and impulse. The organ of human *vigor, vita* and *motus* is the heart, and if it is not physically in the 'middle' of the body—for this is the '*medietas uteri*' or, as the parallel Greek has it, the *ὀμφαλός*—yet, as the *pontificium vivendi* is here, the 'biological' view overrides the mathematical. Similarly, on the cosmic plane, the Sun, though not mathematically the centre, is the fountain from which *anima* and *motus* are infused into

the body of the whole; the idea is not that everything rotates round the sun, but that the sun makes everything grow.

We find the same train of thought in Theon of Smyrna, the Greek author (second century A.D.) of a 'guidebook' to the mathematical passages in Plato. With Theon the argument is not quite as definitely as in Chalcidius put forward as a comment on the Timaeus, but the last words of the paragraph in question clearly refer to the description of the World-Soul as given in that dialogue. I must content myself with translating the most important sentences: "In living beings one thing is the centre of the object as such, that is to say of the living being qua living being, another the centre of its bulk. Thus of ourselves inasmuch as we are living and human beings the centre of our being alive (*ἐμψυχία*) is the heart, which is always in motion and full of heat and therefore the origin of all vital powers; . . . but of our bulk something else is the centre, namely the navel. . . . Of the Cosmos qua Cosmos and living being, the centre of its being alive is the Sun, which is as it were the heart of the whole."⁹

Thus, by means of an ingenious distinction between what we may call the local and the dynamic centre, Chalcidius' and Theon's authority has succeeded in fixing the centre of the World-Soul in the Sun, thereby introducing into the Timaeus a heliocentric point of view which is quite foreign to Plato. The common source of Theon and Chalcidius was identified seventy years ago by Eduard Hiller¹⁰ as the Peripatetic philosopher Adrastus. Yet Adrastus is not at all likely to be the author of this important version of the heliocentric theory. The great Hellenistic philosopher who, while he did not believe in the heliocentric astronomy of Aristarchus of Samos, yet proclaimed with enthusiasm the central function of the Sun in the cosmic organism of growth, heat and life was Posidonius of Apamea. And while I know that we have today to think twice—no, thrice—before we connect his sacred name with any dogma or proposition that we meet in later writers, I notice with relief that even Karl Reinhardt, who more than anyone else has taught us to be cautious in invoking this great name, has recognized Posidonius as the ultimate source of the passages in Theon and Chalcidius.¹¹

FRIEDRICH SOLMSSEN

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

9187.13-188.7 Hiller. The sentences interrupt a discussion of the planetary theory to which they are not germane.

10RM 26, 1871, 582ff.

11Kosmos und Sympathie (Munich 1926) 335. See also F. Cumont, La Théologie solaire (Mem. Acad. Inscr. 12, 1913) 458. It is not certain that Posidonius wrote a commentary on the Timaeus (cf. Reinhardt, Posidonius, Munich 1921, 416); nor can it be taken for granted that in the first century B.C. a commentary was the means a great thinker would use to wrestle with, and assimilate, the thought of another.

⁵Timaeus 34bff, 36b, dff, 38cff.

⁶36e, 34b.

⁷36d, e; cf. 34b.

⁸cordis MSS, editt. There is no point in a reference to the 'centre' of the heart. Uteri medietas is correct, and confirmed by the Greek parallel text (see below).

REVIEWS

Modern Latin Conversation. By ROBERT T. BROWN. v, 58 pages. Heath, Boston 1943 \$0.40

This book of 37 pages purposes to interest students in Latin speech and composition, for the author says in the preface: "The expression of modern ideas in the ancient tongue seems to dispel the mist of time." He dispels the mist in 18 colloquies on daily life.

The reading matter consists of "made" Latin. I find this no objection, if thus the student be induced to read and speak for the fun of it, provided the maker can write Latin. Professor Brown offers simple reading matter in the form of question and answer. Each lesson is followed by a series of questions that the student is expected to answer in his own Latin. If thoroughly drilled in each lesson, and if the conjoined vocabulary be learned, there is no reason why after 18 lessons an ordinarily intelligent student who has previously enjoyed consistent grammatical drill in fundamentals—always requisite—should not carry on a simple conversation on daily life. One omission, however, I consider unfortunate. Quantities are nowhere marked. If Latin speech is to be interesting, musical and natural, quantities and rhythm must in speech be observed. To be learned effectively, they must be impressed on the beginner. Cf. Professor E. H. Sturtevant's article, CW 37.15-7.

Clearly Professor Brown has read widely in Latin literature and can write Latin far above the average. However, he admits some curious expressions, some obviously not Latin and some that would be improved by rephrasing. Some may have resulted from simplifying the Latin to the students' abilities. For instance the answer to: Num idem magister nos omnes res docet? is: Idem magister nos omnes res non docet. I believe that the answer beginning: Non idem . . . would be more emphatic and more illustrative to the student. That is minor but I think the question: Quid est nomen tuum? is of doubtful Latinity. Terence (Ad. 5.6.3) asks the question thus: Qui vocare? The answer here given: Nomen meum est Paulus is less idiomatic than: Mihi nomen est Paulo s. Paulus. I do not approve of: In qua manu graphidem tenes? Let it be: (In) utra . . .? I doubt the phrase (8 et passim) Ad scholam ire. Suetonius (De Gram. 7) used Scholam frequentare; likewise the phrase (8) Negotium meum malum est. Cicero said: Dici non potest quomodo omnia hic iaceant, also negotia mihi parum procedunt. As for Intus eamus (8), Quintilian (1.5.50) says: Eo intus et intro sum soloecismi sunt. As for Da, faveas, coffeam, note that cedo coffeam is by all odds the phrase for 'pass the coffee.' Faveas I consider quite out of bounds. Ovid (M.3.613) and Tibullus (2.5.1) did not mean 'Please.' Better use sis or sodes or amabo. In arithmetic instead of Unus et decem sunt undecim, let it be Fiunt undecim, auctore Columella (V). Pueri

lapides in canem iacere non debent seems odd. Canem lapidibus appetere would be Ciceronian. Then: Quomodo tecum? apparently for 'How's everything with you?' Unless the author can adduce some authority, it ought to be summarily rejected for the established Ut vales? or Quid agis? for in Horace (S.1.9.43) the meaning is quite different. Then why: Cibus est super mensam, instead of: Appositus est cibus, or the Apician: Illatus est cibus? The Latin for 'Heads or tails?' is Capita aut navia? not Capita vel caudae? Aurigare, again, is a neuter verb and should not be used as transitive of driving an automobile. Currus also is preferable to carrus, meaning 'car'; likewise adversarius to opponens.

Gaudeo and placet are misapplied for libet; vado for eo.

I found only four misprints: (27) qui for quia; (31) iacebis for iacies and est for es; (38) indulgite for indulgete.

Notwithstanding these criticisms, and space forbids the mention of others, I do not wish to be misconstrued as condemning this book, for these faults and infelicities can easily disappear in later editions, which I hope will appear. On the contrary I believe it a step in the right direction which, if properly used, can be of great help.

GOODWIN B. BEACH

HARTFORD

The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus with an English translation by EARNEST CARY on the basis of the version of Edward Spelman. In seven volumes. Volume IV (Books VI.49-VII). vi, 385 pages. Harvard University Press, Cambridge; Heinemann, London 1943 (Loeb Classical Library) \$2.50

The fourth volume of Dionysius is the thirteenth by Dr. Cary for the Loeb Classical Library. Students of ancient history long familiar with the nine volumes of the history of Cassius Dio which appeared between 1914 and 1927 now welcome his careful work on the present author and find in it the same high quality in text and translations. Reviews of the previous volumes of Dionysius have already appeared in CLASSICAL WEEKLY. Volume I (1937) was reviewed by Charlotte E. Goodfellow (32.77-8) and Volumes II (1939) and III (1940) by Edward F. D'Arms (35.163-4). As four volumes have appeared since 1937 it is to be hoped that the whole work will soon be completed. Spelman's translation is the only earlier version of this work in English and although often very good it is uneven and in need of revision in accordance with a good modern text. Here as in Dio the translator has used a plain, clear, unadorned English style, pleasing to the reader and suitable for the Atticism of Dionysius.

A sample check of various passages of the translation has not revealed errors. One infelicity is the use of "accommodation" as a translation of *ai διαλλαγαι* (in 6.49.2 *et aliter*) where "reconciliation" would be clearer and more accurate.

The Loeb Classical Library does its greatest service for classicists and historians by the inclusion of such authors as Dionysius. This work is somewhat dull because of the pedestrian gait of the author and the interminable speeches which he inserts, but it contains much of interest concerning early Roman social and political customs, examples of the art of the professional rhetor, curious events, character studies and many references to the lost works of history. In this volume only four years are covered although both earlier and later his narrative moves more speedily. Two outstanding events are presented in great detail. The quarrel between patricians and plebeians and the return of the latter from the Sacred Mount is contained in book 6.49-90. Two sessions of the senate and a long conference between senatorial envoys and the plebeians occupy most of the narrative. The famous speech by Agrippa Menenius in which the state is compared to a human body is included (6.83.3-86). About it Dionysius says: "his speech is thought worthy of record and it is quoted in all the ancient histories" (6.83.2). In addition to this and to a series of short discourses three other long speeches are included (6.49.3-56 by Menenius; 59.2-64 by Claudius; 72.3-80 by Junius). The other incident spun out to great length is the account of the actions, trial and condemnation of C. Marcius Coriolanus (7.21-67). Within this episode are four extended epideictic speeches (7.22-24 by Coriolanus; 28-32 by Minucius; 40-46 by Decius; 48-53 by Claudius). Of particular interest in this episode and in its sequel (8.1-62) are two factors: the sympathy of Dionysius with the conservative point of view and the use of material from this work by Plutarch in his *Vita Coriolani*. One short section contains a dramatic account of Cumae and Aristodemus, tyrant of Cumae (7.2.4-11).

How much material in addition to the text and the translation should be included in the volumes of the Loeb Library is a question of great interest. The general policy for the editors must be conservative but some flexibility is possible.

Two supplements would make the volumes of this work even more valuable. A short analysis of the narrative and a table of the parallel passages in Livy and Dionysius in each volume would be useful as an introduction in each volume. The notes include a good list of the pertinent passages in Livy but it would be worthwhile to have them concentrated. The second suggestion concerns the index which is very brief and contains proper names only. Since the ninth volume of Dio includes a general index of 82 pages, the seventh volume of Dionysius may contain the

same feature, but each volume would profit by a much longer index. The exegetical notes are fairly numerous and quite valuable.

Dr. Cary made the following statement in the first volume: "The Greek text here presented is based on the edition of Jacoby, but departs rather frequently from his text" (xliii). The care with which Jacoby's text has been examined is indicated by the large number of critical notes—683 notes in 190 pages of Greek. It is particularly interesting to observe that 28 variations from Jacoby's text or emendations originating with Dr. Cary, Professor Capps and Professor Post are included. Twenty of these are incorporated in the text. The passages are as follows—Cary 6.96.1; 7.29.2, 44.2, 46.5, 48.1, 51.6; Capps 6.73.2; 7.1.1, 44.2, 46.3, 50.2; Post 6.56.4, 62.1 (*bis*), 62.3, 62.5, 78.3, 84.3, 85.3, (*bis*), 86.5 (*bis*), 87.1; 7.1.6, 20.2, 23.1, 55.1, 72.11. Recently Professor Post discussed in detail his emendation in 7.72.11 and another in 9.24.2 which is not in this volume (cw 37.27-8). Professor B. L. Ullman discussed the former emendation in CPh 39 (1944) 47-8.

WILLIAM C. McDERMOTT

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Conquest of Epidemic Disease. A Chapter in the History of Ideas. By CHARLES-EDWARD AMORY WINSLOW. xiii, 411 pages. Princeton University Press, Princeton 1943 \$4.50

A popular history of epidemiology from the pen of a prominent authority in the field of public health is indeed a welcome book. Dr. Winslow's account of man's attempts to cope with the baffling problem of ascertaining the causes of the spread of epidemic disease is sufficiently interesting to hold the attention of even the casual layman. The book opens with a discussion of primitive concepts and closes with the results of recent research undertaken by leading public health doctors. It tells a truly remarkable story, recording on the one hand many instances of brilliant flashes of insight coming to investigators whose observations were centuries in advance of their time and, on the other, frequent disappointing setbacks sustained because the erroneous explanation seemed so much more plausible than the correct one.

The foundation of the present work was laid in considerable study of little read writings of pioneers, laymen as well as specialists, who contributed to the progress of epidemiology. Particularly significant in the reviewer's opinion are Dr. Winslow's discussion of the plague literature, his sympathetic treatment of Kircher, and his penetrating analysis of the observations of some men who rarely receive appreciable attention in the standard medical histories, notably Mead, Noah Webster, Snow, Budd, and Pettenkofer. These studies con-

stitute a distinctive contribution to medical history; there is a freshness about the book that removes it from consideration as just another work on the subject.

A rediscovered work by the Spanish physician de Isla dealing with the treatment for syphilis of several members of Columbus' crew and the unearthing of pre-Columbian graves of aborigines with marks of syphilitic infection are adduced as evidence for the reaffirmation of the Columbian sources of syphilis in Europe (124).

A passage excerpted from Wynne-Finch's translation of Fracastorius' *Syphilis* (129-30) is strikingly like the invocation of the Aeneid and the Homeric simile of the shepherd amazed as he surveys his wheat field caught up in flames, and another passage (131) is slightly reminiscent of the Lucretian explanation of the origin of epidemics. Perhaps it was echoes or fancied echoes such as these that influenced Cardinal Bembo to compare Fracastorius with Vergil and Lucretius. Charles and Dorothea Singer's "scarce, privately-printed treatise on *The Development of the Doctrine of Contagium Virum*" (150) is also to be found in the XVIIth International Congress of Medicine, London 1913, Section XXIII: "History of Medicine," Oxford Press, London 1914, 187-206.

Dr. Winslow is on more familiar ground after he emerges from the classical period, and speaks with greater assurance. The opening chapters do not compare favorably with the remainder of the book. They suffer from the disproportionately large amount of quoted material drawn from authorities of vastly different backgrounds. Extended successions of these quoted passages produce an unevenness of text that is distracting to the reader. Moreover, the extreme compression of material on primitive and occult medicine presumes a familiarity with the principles involved. One gets the impression that he is reading from an abridgement of the abridged edition of *The Golden Bough*, although Frazer is not used. The doctrine of the macrocosm, for example, is ascribed an important place in mediaeval medicine, but the reader is left to imagine the meaning of the explanation that "the human body and the physical universe exhibit a mystic parallelism" (44).

An interesting contrast between the relative absence of demonology in the Old Testament and prevalence in the New Testament is drawn (8-12). It is of course inaccurate to regard sixteen references in Matthew, nineteen in Mark, and twenty in Luke in the ordinary manner as documentations of demonology, since these are synoptic versions. Furthermore, the inference that a background of New Testament demonology was an important factor in the tendency of science to revert to animism (12) would be extremely difficult to substantiate. It is true that conscious reminiscences of New Testament experience are found everywhere in the writings of the Church Fathers, but these literary allusions are mere straws in a Welstrom.

The author speaks of two treatises by Galen devoted

to astrology, without giving their titles (43). The one from which he quotes, *Prognostica de decubitu ex mathematica scientia*, was listed by Ackermann (Kühn ed., I.xix) among the "libri manifeste spurii." Charles Singer also considers the astrological works attributed to Galen spurious (*The Legacy of Greece*, 244).

Dr. Winslow has caught a fascination for Galen that must have been the lot of every scholar who has turned for the first time to that enormous storehouse of twenty-one volumes of text in the Kühn edition. One approaches Galen with the same feeling of expectancy with which he dips into Pliny's *Natural History*, and he is not disappointed. Much labor must have been required to scan those works in order to cull representative passages on the causation of epidemic disease. These are presented here with brief comment. Dr. Winslow's studies leave him with a feeling of deep admiration for Galen, who he believes has been unfairly dealt with. His cryptic remark, twice made (69, 71), that Galen was probably the second greatest "figure" in the history of medicine can only be taken to refer to his pre-eminent reputation over so long a span of recorded medical history. Surely a man to whom the pen was as dear as the scalpel and who has been unable to escape the charges of charlatanry, early and late, levelled at him, cannot be accorded the position next to Hippocrates for his intrinsic merits.

Galen's rank among physicians has always been a subject of heated discussion and of wide divergences of opinion. An authoritative re-evaluation of his merits must await a careful examination of the Alexandrians and of the extent of his indebtedness to them. It is surprising, as Dr. Winslow suggests, that so little work has been done upon this author. He was undoubtedly one of the most influential writers of all time and yet the text of his writings has been almost terra incognita to the greater number of those who have expressed opinions about him. In these respects his plight is exactly like that of Ptolemy, and herein must be added another analogy to the long list of astonishing parallels between the two men in their respective fields. The Syriac versions of the Galenic corpus and of the epitomators of Galen were largely responsible for the high calibre of medicine in the Near East as the Arabic versions from the Syriac were for the excellence of Arabic medicine. Similarly Ptolemy's *Almagest*, comprehended by the more brilliant minds of the Middle Ages, such as Proclus, and vaguely grasped at second, third, or fourth hand by far from brilliant pagan and Neoplatonic commentators, was chiefly instrumental in keeping alive the belief in a spherical earth. These two works were so comprehensive and awe-inspiring that they stifled virtually all original thinking, and the body of their contents was so substantial that a fourth-hand borrower became a cherished authority. Because each work was founded upon a fallacy (Galen's anatomy upon animals and Ptolemy's astronomy upon the geo-

centric hypothesis) modern historians in their fondness for the achievements of the leading thinkers of the Renaissance have given rise to the general impression that modern medicine began when Vesalius denounced Galen and modern astronomy when Copernicus denounced Ptolemy. On the contrary the fund of classical medicine and astronomy, accumulated and developed through the Hellenic, Alexandrian, and Imperial periods and consummated by Galen and Ptolemy, constitutes the framework and body of early Renaissance medicine and astronomy, and the first Renaissance adjustments, however revolutionary, are of small extent.

The problem of inconsistencies and conventions in mediaeval cognomina is a vexing one. Thorndike has done a great deal to introduce some order into a distressing situation. It is certainly not in the interests of clarity, however, to refer to Albertus Magnus by his approved name (95) and elsewhere to refer to him as "Albert the Great" (42) and "Albert of Cologne" (107); "Wanderjähre" (59) should be written "Wanderjahre" and "Zenophone" (60 and Index) should be written "Xenophon."

WILLIAM H. STAHL

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Ahmad B. At-Tayyib as-Sarahsi. By FRANZ ROSENTHAL. iv, 135 pages. American Oriental Society, New Haven 1943 (American Oriental Series, Volume 26) \$3

The ninth century, particularly its latter half, marks the beginning of the most glorious and prolific period in Moslem culture. When the purely Arab dynasty of the Omayyads ceased to exist (750 A.D.), the non-Arab elements came to the foreground both politically and culturally. The Abbasid epoch afforded political power to the Persians, while other neophytes established themselves in the realms of science and literature. Through the medium of Jews and Christians the Arabs familiarized themselves with the heritage of the Hellenistic world. Were it not for the translations of Galen, Hippocrates, Dioscorides, Plato, Aristotle and many others, there certainly would have been no such Moslem culture as prevailed through the Dark Ages. Those translations from Greek into Arabic (or re-translations from Hebrew and Syriac) which filled the culture vacuum of the first century of the Abbasid rule (750-850) not only laid the foundation of Moslem civilization but also stimulated some Eastern scholars to perpetuate the classical heritage. The overwhelming majority of those scholars were non-Arabic in origin, though their works were written in Arabic, the language of the conqueror.

Two great scholars gave the impetus to the "Golden Period" of Moslem culture. One, Hunain ibn Ishaq

(Joanitus) the wizard-translator, was a Nestorian Christian and the other, the famous al-Kindi, was a Syrian Jew. Al-Kindi's universal knowledge was proverbial. In his 265 works he dealt with all branches of science known in the Hellenistic as well as in the non-Hellenistic world. His philosophical outlook is strongly Neo-Platonic, while his scientific structure is based on Neo-Pythagorean mathematics. Universalism of knowledge is also the main trait of Ahmad b. at-Tayyib as Sarahsi, al-Kindi's disciple. According to Franz Rosenthal's reasonable calculations, Ahmad b. at-Tayyib was born between 833 and 837 at Sarahs, Iran. The year of his death is definitely fixed at 899. His renown in scholarship as well as his spiritual affinity to al-Kindi made possible his appointment as an educator to the Abbasid prince al-Mu'tadid, who later became caliph. As such al-Mu'tadid bestowed upon Ahmad the honor of being his *nadim* 'boon-companion,' and also vested in his hands two important administrative offices. Ahmad's heyday, however, was very short-lived, for he soon fell in disgrace and paid with his life for some (not fully explained) transgressions. According to all sources available, the downfall of Ahmad may be attributed to his "heretic" (liberal) views on Islam. Though Rosenthal does not discard the assumption, he nevertheless contends that some political machinations of Ahmad's rivals at the Caliph's court are in a great degree responsible for his execution.

Only a few fragments (some of them of doubtful authority) of Ahmad's works have been preserved. We do know, however, several scores of titles which prove how universal and prolific a scholar Ahmad b. Tayyib was. Among the numerous subjects dealt with are: religion, history of religion, philosophy, psychology, politics, physics, geography, topography, history, administration, culture, astronomy, astrology, mathematics, music and medicine. Though it may be assumed that, except for geography and literature, Ahmad showed little originality, for he followed his master, al-Kindi, yet his knowledge of the classical works was undoubtedly profound. The foremost authority to whom Ahmad referred in his works was Aristotle, of course. He often refers to such books as Aristotle's *Physics*, *De Generatione et Corruptione*, *De Sensu et Sensato*, *Metaphysics*, *Meteorology*, *De Anima* and others.

Franz Rosenthal's study possesses a great many qualities of genuine scholarship. It is thorough and well documented, based upon a long list of sources, both Arabic and non-Arabic. The innumerable critical notes speak for most objective research and cautiousness in final conclusions. Four hitherto unpublished texts of Ahmad b. Tayyib conclude this book about a famous scholar and litterateur.

M. J. STEINER

HEBREW COLLEGE, CHICAGO